

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 06279 01 OF 02 121656Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00

OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02

SS-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 AECE-00 /079 W

----- 077490

O 121440Z NOV 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8727

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 6279

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION NOVEMBER 11 RE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT
TO AIR MANPOWER

REF: A. USNATO 6203; B) USNATO 6223; C) USNATO 6227; D) STATE 247443

SUMMARY: U.S. REP PER REF D INTRODUCED AT NOVEMBER 11 SPC MEETING
MISSION'S "OPTION I" PROPOSAL TO AUTHORIZE AHG TO OFFER REPLACEMENT
TO PRESENT NON-INCREASE ON GROUND FORCES COMMITMENT BY A NEW COMMIT-
MENT FOR GROUND AND AIR, HAVING NOTHING TO DO WITH PHASE LINKAGE.
FRG REP WITHDREW ORIGINAL FRG PROPOSAL AND INTRODUCED NEW LANGUAGE
IN THE DIRECTION OF MAKING THE OFFER TO THE OTHER SIDE MORE GENERAL
(WHICH WAS MISSION'S OPTION II IN REFS A AND B). CANADIAN REP
SUPPORTED U.S. PROPOSAL AND BELGIAN REP SUPPORTED
FRG PROPOSAL. UK AND NETHERLANDS REPS LEANED TOWARD FRG PROPOSAL.
MISSION REQUESTS INSTRUCTIONS ENABLING US AT NOVEMBER 14 SPC, IF SUP-
PORT IS LACKING FOR U.S. PROPOSAL, TO WORK TOWARD IMPROVEMENT OF
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06279 01 OF 02 121656Z

FRG PROPOSAL. END SUMMARY

1. U.S. REP (.9943) INTRODUCED OPTION I APPROACH (OFFERING TO
REPLACE GROUND FORCES COMMITMENT BY AIR/GROUND COMMITMENT)

AS DESCRIBED REFS A AND B. U.S. REP DESCRIBED U.S. PROPOSAL AS AN ATTEMPT TO FIND AN APPROACH TO NON-INCREASE OF AIR MANPOWER WHICH WOULD HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE GROUND FORCES COMMITMENT MADE IN THE PHASE LINKAGE CONTEXT, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME ALLOWING FOR THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AGGREGATE GROUND/AIR CEILING. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID HE WOULD RECOMMEND THE U.S. PROPOSAL TO HIS AUTHORITIES, AND HE WAS SURE IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THEM. UK (BAILES), NETHERLANDS (BUWALDA), AND FRG (HOYNCK) EXPRESSED CONCERN THE PROPOSAL MIGHT SEEM TO THE EAST AN ATTEMPT TO TAKE BACK SOMETHING ALREADY OFFERED, I.E. THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON GROUND FORCES MADE TO LINK THE PHASES. FRG REP ALSO DOUBTED THAT THIS WOULD BE ENOUGH FOR HIS AUTHORITIES, SINCE THE U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD STILL PROVIDE ONE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT FOR AIR AND GROUND, WHICH MIGHT STILL LEAVE EAST WITH IMPRESSION OF ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO REDUCE AIR MANPOWER IN PHASE II.

2. US REP POINTED OUT US PROPOSAL DOES NOT CALL FOR WITHDRAWING AN OFFER, BUT FOR SEEING IF THE EAST IS INTERESTED IN AN EXPANDED OFFER IN A DIFFERENT CONTEXT. IF THE EAST WERE NOT INTERESTED THE ALLIES WOULD CERTAINLY NOT WITHDRAW THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON GROUND FORCES MADE IN THE PHASE LINKAGE CONTEXT. HE ALSO STRESSED THAT THE NEW US SUGGESTION HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH PHASE LINKAGE AND THE OTHER SIDE COULD NOT LOGICALLY CONSTRUCT IT AS A LINK TO PHASE II AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS. (NOTE: THE US PROPOSAL APPEARS AS THE "OR" PARAGRAPH IN THE TEXT AT THE END OF THIS MESSAGE.)

3. FRG REP SAID BONN WAS PREPARED TO DROP ITS PREVIOUS PROPOSAL (THE "OR" PARAGRAPH IN REF C), AND TO PROPOSE NEW LANGUAGE IN THE DIRECTION OF MAKING THE OFFER TO THE EAST "A LITTLE MORE VAGUE. "THUS, THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE COULD REFER TO A "NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT OF AIR MANPOWER," RATHER THAN TO A COMMITMENT NOT TO INCREASE AIR MANPOWER. SIMILARLY, FRG COULD MAKE THE HINT OF EXTENSION OF THIS COMMITMENT INTO PHASE II MORE VAGUE THAN IT HAD BEEN IN PREVIOUS FRG VERSION. FRG CAN ACCEPT LANGUAGE INSTRUCTING AHG TO MAKE CLEAR TO THE SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06279 01 OF 02 121656Z

TO HER SIDE THAT ALLIES WERE NOT PREJUDGING THE ISSUE OF AGGREGATE OR SEPARATE SERVICE CEILINGS. FINALLY, FRG COULD DROP ITS SENTENCE INSTRUCTING AHG TO REMIND THE FACT THAT THE QUESTION OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION RE GROUND FORCES MANPOWER REDUCTIONS REMAINS TO BE SETTLED. FRG REP THEN INTRODUCED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE ALONG THESE LINES WHICH APPEARS AS THE "EITHER" PARAGRAPH, AND THE FIRST PARAGRAPH UNDER "PLUS" IN THE TEXT AT THE END OF THIS MESSAGE.

4. THE "EITHER" PARAGRAPH IN THE TEXT BELOW CONTAINS TWO BRACKETS. "IN ADDITION" IS THE FRG LANGUAGE. "AS A COMPLEMENT" REPRESENTS THE DUTCH SUGGESTION AT THE PREVIOUS SPC MEETING WHICH THE UK ACCEPTED AT THIS SPC MEETING.

5. US REP POINTED OUT THAT OFFERING THE OTHER SIDE A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER, PER THE "EITHER" PARAGRAPH, SEEMED TO CONTRADICT TELLING THE OTHER SIDE THAT THIS DID NOT PREJUDGE THE QUESTION OF OVERALL OR SEPARATE SERVICE CEILINGS, PER THE "PLUS" PARAGRAPH. IT WAS HARD TO SEE HOW THE AHG WOULD REPLY TO EASTERN QUESTIONS ON THIS APPARENT CONTRADICTION. HE OBSERVED THAT THIS DIFFICULTY DID NOT ARISE UNDER THE US PROPOSAL.

6. UK REP ASKED FOR DELETION IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE "PLUS" PARAGRAPH OF THE STATEMENT THAT THE COMMITMENT IN NO WAY IMPLIES AN OBLIGATION TO REDUCT AIR MANPOWER IN THE SECOND PHASE. SHE SAID THE UK DOES NOT WANT TO TELL THE WARSAW PACT IN THE SAME BREATH THAT ALLIES ARE FOR NON-INCREASE, BUT AGAINST REDUCTIONS, AS THIS WOULD BE COUNTER PRODUCTIVE. US REP NOTED THAT US WAS THE ORIGINAL AUTHOR OF THE PHARASE IN QUESTION, AND THAT WE COULD GO WITH THE MAJORITY ON THAT PHRASE. HOWEVER, NO MATTER WHAT GUIDANCE THE NAC SENDS TO VIENNA ON NON-INCREASE, THE OTHER SIDE WILL ASK IF THIS MEANS ALLIED READINESS TO REDUCE AIR MANPOWER. UNTIL AND UNLESS ALLIES MODIFY THEIR POSITION ON THE SUBJECT OF REDUCTIONS, AHG WOULD HAVE TO SAY NO, SO THERE DID NOT SEEM ANY REASON FOR DELETING IT FROM THE INSTRUCTION. FRG REP SAID HE WELCOMED THE US COMMENT, AND DID NOT BELIEVE BONN COULD ACCEPT ANY GUIDANCE ON NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WHICH DID NOT INSTRUCT AHG TO TELL THE EAST THAT THE OFFER WOULD NOT IMPLY AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS IN PHASE II. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) AND NETHERLANDS REP ALSO
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 06279 01 OF 02 121656Z

STATED THAT THEIR GOVERNMENTS WOULD WANT THE PHRASE IN THE GUIDANCE. MC REP (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) STATED HE KNEW THAT THIS WOULD ALSO BE THE VIEW OF NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES.

7. US REP INQUIRED IF THE NEW FRG PROPOSAL DID NOT LEAVE OPEN THE DURATION OF THE COMMITMENT OF AIR MANPOWER. UK REP SAID UK CONSIDERED THAT INHERENT IN THE IDEA OF AN AIR NAMPOWER COMMITMENT FOR NON-CIRCUMVENTION OF FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT IS THAT IT WOULD CORRESPOND IN DURATION TO THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON GROUND FORCES. FRG AND BELGIAN REPS SHARED THIS VIEW.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06279 02 OF 02 121658Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00

OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02

SS-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 AECE-00 /079 W

----- 077515

O 121440Z NOV 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8728

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 6279

8. BELGIAN REP ACCEPTED THE FRG PROPOSAL AD REFERENDUM.

9. COMMENT: INITIAL SPC REACTION TO US AND FRG PROPOSALS WAS FOR CANADA TO SUPPORT US PROPOSAL, AND BELGIUM TO SUPPORT FRG PROPOSAL, WITH UK AND NETHERLANDS REPS SHOWING PREFERENCE FOR WORKING WITH FRG PROPOSALS. MISSION NOTES THAT THE FRG PROPOSAL IS IN THE DIRECTION OF THE SECOND OPTION PROPOSED BY THE MISSION, I.E., MAKING THE OFFER TO THE OTHER SIDE A LITTLE VAGUER, AND DEFERRING THE QUESTION OF HOW ALLIES MIGHT EVENTUALLY PROVIDE FOR AN AGGREGATE GROUND/AIR CEILING. MISSION SUGGESTS INSTRUCTIONS ENABLING US AT THE NOVEMBER 14 SPC, IF SUPPORT IS LACKING FOR US PROPOSAL, TO WORK ON IMPROVEMENT OF FRG PROPOSAL.

10. GUIDANCE TO AHG UNDER "OPTION II" SHOULD PROVIDE A SIGNAL SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR TO THE OTHER SIDE, BUT SUFFICIENTLY GENERAL ON HOW THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT MIGHT BE ACHIEVED. WE SEE MERIT TO SUGGESTION MADE FOLLOWING THE SPC MEETING BY THE UK AND
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06279 02 OF 02 121658Z

BELGIAN REPS TO REPLACE "NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER" IN "EITHER" PARAGRAPH, BY "LIMITATION ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER." THIS PHRASE, COUPLED WITH EXISTING CAVEAT AGAINST REDUCTIONS LATER IN GUIDANCE, SHOULD NOT CREATE IMPRESSION OF WILLINGNESS TO AGREE TO A LIMITATION INVOLVING AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS.

11. IF US DOES WISH TO WORK WITH FRG LANGUAGE, WE BELIEVE US SHOULD SUPPORT "IN ADDITION" IN "EITHER" PARAGRAPH, RATHER THAN DUTCH SUGGESTION OF "AS A COMPLEMENT," SINCE WE JUDGE "IN ADDITION" REFLECTS STRONG FRG INTEREST IN COMPLETELY SEPARATE COMMITMENTS.

12. THE FINAL BRACKETED SENTENCE IN THE "PLUS" SECTION NOW SEEMS REDUNDANT IN VIEW OF INCLUSION OF THIS NOTION IN A

MORE GENERAL FASHION IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE "PLUS"
SECTION. END COMMENT

13. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE IN TIME FOR NOVEMBER 14 SPC
MEETING.

BEGIN TEXT.

MBFR: AIR (AND GROUND) MANPOWER NON-INCREASE/NON-CIRCUMVENTION
EITHER

(ALLIED NEGOTIATORS ARE AUTHORISED TO SUGGEST TO
THEIR WARSAW PACT COLLEAGUES THAT, IN ORDER TO AVOID POSSIBLE
CIRCUMVENTION, A MUTUAL NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR FORCE
MANPOWER SHOULD BE CONSIDERED (IN ADDITION) (AS A COMPLEMENT)
TO THE MUTUAL NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON GROUND MANPOWER.)

OR

(ALLIED NEGOTIATORS ARE AUTHORISED TO SUGGEST TO
THEIR WARSAW PACT COLLEAGUES THAT, IN ORDER TO AVOID POSSIBLE
CIRCUMVENTION OF THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT, THE ALLIES ARE
PREPARED TO CONSIDER A MUTUAL COMMITMENT NOT TO INCREASE THE
OVERALL LEVEL OF AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER BEYOND THE LEVEL
EXISTING AT THE TIME OF CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT,
TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE REDUCTIONS OF US AND SOVIET FORCES
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06279 02 OF 02 121658Z

ESTABLISHED IN THAT AGREEMENT. THIS COMMITMENT WOULD REPLACE
THE COMMITMENT PREVIOUSLY OFFERED FOR GROUND FORCES IN THE
PHASE LINKAGE CONTEXT, SINCE THIS AIR/GROUND COMMITMENT IS
OFFERED IN A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT CONTEXT, NON-CIRCUMVENTION.
ALLIED NEGOTIATORS WOULD INFORM THE WARSAW PACT, WHEN THEY
CONSIDERED IT APPROPRIATE, THAT:

(A) THE NON- INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD COME INTO FORCE
ONLY UPON CONCLUSION OF A SATISFACTORY FIRST PHASE
AGREEMENT (IN ACCORDANCE WITH C-M(73)83(FINAL)),
INCLUDING, IN PARTICULAR, THE COMMON CEILING
CONCEPT.

(B) THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT WOULD BECOME INVALID IF
THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED OR IF
THE SECOND PHASE NEGOTIATIONS WERE BROKEN OFF. A
SATISFACTORY SECOND PHASE AGREEMENT, WHEN CONCLUDED,
WOULD AUTOMATICALLY SUPERSEDE THE NON-INCREASE
COMMITMENT.

(C) IN ANY EVENT, THE COMMITMENT WOULD BE LIMITED IN
DURATION TO A FIVE YEAR PERIOD.)

PLUS

(ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR TO THE

EAST THAT THIS COMMITMENT, WHICH WOULD BE OF A TEMPORARY NATURE, IN NO WAY IMPLIES AN OBLIGATION TO REDUCE AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN THE SECOND PHASE, BUT THAT THE ALLIES WOULD BE PREPARED TO CONSIDER APPROPRIATE WAYS OF COVERING AIR FORCE MANPOWER IN CONNECTION WITH A SECOND PHASE AGREEMENT. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ALSO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE TERMS OF THIS OFFER DO NOT PREJUDICE THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THERE WILL EVENTUALLY BE (EITHER BETWEEN PHASES OR IN THE SECOND PHASE) AN OVERALL CEILING ON GROUND AND AIR FORCE MANPOWER COMBINED, OR SEPARATE SUB-CEILINGS ON GROUND AND AIR FORCE MANPOWER. (THIS IS A QUESTION WHICH HAS STILL TO BE DECIDED WITHIN THE ALLIANCE.))

ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD REFRAIN FROM GOING INTO FURTHER DETAIL AT THIS TIME. THEY SHOULD TELL EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES THAT QUESTIONS OF DETAIL WOULD BE DEALT WITH AT A LATER STAGE WHEN SPECIFICS OF ALL SUGGESTED COMMITMENTS WOULD BE DISCUSSED. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD TELL THE EAST
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 06279 02 OF 02 121658Z

THAT NATURALLY, AT THAT LATER STAGE, SOME LIMITS AGREED EXCEPTIONS SHOULD BE MADE TO PROVIDE FOR NORMAL EXERCISES AND ROTATIONS.

(IF ASKED, ALLIED NEGOTIATORS COULD INDICATE THAT THEY WOULD EXPECT A COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER TO BE COVERED IN SOME WAY IN A SECOND PHASE AGREEMENT.)

END TEXT.
MCAULIFFE.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 NOV 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO06279
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741185/abbryykv.tel
Line Count: 301
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 6203; B) USNATO 6223; C) USNATO 6227; D) STATE 247443
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <24 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION NOVEMBER 11 RE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT TO AIR MANPOWER
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005